# Mark Scheme (Results) J anuary 2007 

## GCE

GCE General Studies (6454/ 01)

## Section A

All questions in section A examine AO1 - Students should be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding with application to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.

1 (a) Which of the following are not associated with the development of a form of moral reasoning?

C (no alternative)
(b) Write down the name of one of the men listed who is associated with the development of a form of moral reasoning. Name the moral reasoning he is associated with

Allow any of the three possible. No marks if answer does not contain both name and form of moral reasoning. NO marks if the wrong combination is chosen.

Bentham and Utilitarianism (not 'consequentialism')
OR
Hobbes and Social Contract
OR
Kant and the Categorical Imperative
No alternatives
Do not allow a candidate who offers a name not in the list provided.
Answers must have a named form of moral reasoning and not a description as well as an individual taken from the list above.

No marks if only an individual or a form of moral reasoning No marks if the individuals and forms of reasoning are mixed up

Allow variations in spelling, provided answers are recognisable.
Which of the following beliefs are associated with Christianity?

## One mark for each accurate response.

Note the question is about media not government or individuals Do not allow specific examples (e.g. Panorama or News) the question concerns methods of persuasion.

It is NOT simply about theory of media influence. Answers must be clearly related to impact on the public.

Answers which deal simply with the influence of the media and do not relate in at least one of the responses to influence in time of international crises should not score more than 2 marks, even if three otherwise good responses are provided.

Possible responses might include:

- Selection of news to shape our view
- Emphasis given to stories (including time allocated and place in running order)
- Use of editorial bias to distort slant of stories (Biased presentation)
- Use of emotive language and images
- Use of celebrity presenters or commentators
- Excluding alternative views
- Use of visuals to create desired impact
- Framing
- Provision of context (historical, social, political etc.)
- Focus on 'the human' angle
- Appeal to patriotism/ nationalism/ self interest
- Selection of headlines
- Selection of facts, statistics and/ or opinions
etc
NB. Points should be specific - don't double reward a general point with a specific point that is similar.

Do not credit material that does not relate to either economic or social circumstances. Answers do not require specific examples but they may be credited where relevant.

Note the question asks for explanation not simply a listing of points but this can be achieved either by the presentation of several different reasons or by comment and development of a reason. It is not enough to state an
influence; there should be an attempt to show how it is an influence.
Answers must relate to either social or economic circumstances
Allow one mark for candidate who demonstrates a clear understanding of 'artistic creativity'
[1 mark]
One mark for up to each of three different accurate points
[1+1+1 marks ]
Or
One mark for a simple assertion without development or explanation [1mark]
One or two additional marks for development explaining how creativity the chosen influence may affect creativity
[1+1 mark]

Detailed answers which are based on a specific example or artist should normally be credited at the top mark.

Possible answers might include:

- Role of patronage;
- Commissions;
- Fashion;
- Social issues (eg poverty, overcrowding
- Influence of foreign travel;
- political stability;
- economic prosperity or depression;
- social taboos
- availability of resources and materials to the artist
- personal experiences of the artist
- family traditions and pressures
- etc.

Answers may deal with either social or economic or social and economic influences.

NB. Any combination of routes to achieve max 3

Candidates may choose any of the three criteria. No marks simply for making a choice.

One mark for a choice with a simple statement to support the choice
One mark for clear explanation of arithmetic
[1 mark]
One mark for explanation of the chosen criteria or for explaining why aesthetic criteria should be used

One mark for each of two or more simple reasons (max 2)
Allow up to two marks for an explanation of why the other two criteria were rejected

Allow one mark for explanation of one or two or more reasons [1+1 marks]
Points made might include:
Form concerns method of production used to create a work;

- Use or misuse of styles; - combination of stylistic features
- Original features or copies
- Level of skill and craftsmanship
- Unity of form

Longevity concerns the age of the work (compared to comparable works that have not survived)

- How long the work has survived
- Why it has survived so long - luck, fashion, fame, creator, special qualities
- Is old always better than new?

Content concerns how a work affects the audience

- Message
- Effect on individuals
- Moral content
- Comment on the human condition

Aesthetic criteria used to compare works of similar styles or of different styles

NB. Any combination of routes to achieve max 3 marks.

## Section B

All questions in Section B examine AO4 - Students should be able to demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge and of the relationship between them, appreciating their limitations.

Questions 7d should be used to assess AO2 - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

6 (a) (i) What is an argument from analogy?
Reasoning based on a comparison of two similar things or ideas that have features in common in order to emphasise a point or draw a conclusion. In other words analogy uses old ideas to develop new knowledge.

One mark for any of the following points up to a maximum of 2 [1 +1 marks]
One mark for use of comparison
One mark for similarities between things compared
One mark for drawing lessons from past experience
One mark for drawing conclusion about the present based on past experience One mark for an accurate example of analogy
(b) Give one reason to explain why an argument from analogy might be considered a weak form of argument

One mark for a reasonable suggestion:
Depends on the closeness/ similarity of comparison
Depends on appropriateness of the comparison
analogies often do not have a close link of ideas or principles
may be created to support a conclusion
reasoning/ links may be flimsy.
[1 mark]
7 (a) Which of the quotes consists of opinion only?
A (No alternative)
(b) Which quote contains both fact (objectivity) and opinion (subjectivity)?

## Statement (v) (No alternative)

(c) Describe one way in which..........could be tested to establish whether it is true or false.
1 mark for suggesting or describing a type of test that could be used
[1 mark]
1 mark for comment. This may relate to how the test could be administered; why it would be appropriate, who should be involved etc.
[1 mark]
Possible answers might include:

- questionnaires,
- observation,
- samples,
- controlled experiment.

Note: the test is to establish the truth of a
DO NOT allow unethical forms of testing such as introducing one group into another area to see what happens
(d) (i) Which one of the statements below would provide the best conclusion to the passage?

C (No alternative).
This conclusion is actually given in the first paragraph.
A. The article actually criticizes multiculturalism
B. The article argues that policy has not been tough enough
D. Schools are criticized for multiculturalism and selectivity, not for their teaching of English
(ii) How successfully do the evidence and arguments presented by the author support your choice of conclusion?

Note the question does not ask the candidate whether they agree with the conclusion but whether the author presents a sufficient case to justify it. Evidence not presented in the passage is not admissible unless it is used, for example, to illustrate deficiency. The aim of the question is to test thinking and analytical skills, not simply comprehension.

Do not allow a mark for unsupported agreement/ disagreement unless using thinking and analytical skills.

Mark according to the following points up to a maximum $3+1$ (where 1 mark is reserved for an explicit reference to the success/ sufficiency of the evidence.

1 mark for a candidates justified conclusion related to the question (ie. Candidate gives an opinion of how successful the author has been together with a simple reason. The reason may not be closely related to T and A skills.

1 mark for candidates who make a simple link between the evidence used and the author's claim.

1 mark for candidates who make a simple link between the type(s) of argument(s) used and the author's claim

1/2 additional marks for explicit consideration of the strength (or weakness) of the evidence used (note this is NOT simply 'amount' of evidence)

1/ 2 additional marks for explicit consideration of the strength (or weakness) of the type of argument(s) used

Reserve the $4^{\text {th }}$ mark for an explicit reference to sufficiency/ success

## Allow any combination of these routes up to a maximum of 4 marks

DO NOT allow a mark for a simple summary of the content or précis of the passage unless it clearly addresses the question.

Answers that:

- Agree or disagree but without any supporting comments (reasons or evidence) are BBL $=0$ marks
- Describe content rather than examine quality of evidence or argument, or that simply summarise the passage without any of the agreed points, 0 marks
NB. Can argue for ay of the four statements.

Points that could be made include:

- The passage presents a single viewpoint
- It is an unbalanced/ one sided argument
- Considerable opinion and assertion but not much factual evidence is used in support
- Factual evidence is not presented to oppose the argument
- Mainly inductive reasoning
- No evidence to support claimed rise in racism
- Appropriate supporting evidence may be cited

Questions that candidates could ask/ answer include:
o Is evidence primarily objective or subjective
o Does the author rely on emotive language or ideas
o Is the argument balanced or one sided
o Are there obvious deficiencies in the argument
o What types of argument are used
o Is valid evidence ignored or dismissed too easily
o Does the conclusion follow automatically from the evidence cited

A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these level guidelines:

| The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter <br> of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few <br> grammatical or spelling errors. | 3 marks <br> (above average) |
| :--- | :--- |
| The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, <br> arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not <br> inhibit communication. | $\mathbf{2}$ marks |
| (average) |  |
| The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an <br> inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places <br> grammar and spelling inhibit communication. | I mark <br> (below average) |
| The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there <br> may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling OR there is too little of the <br> candidate's own writing to assess reliably (as is sometimes the case in <br> Section B). | 0 marks <br> (exceptionally <br> poor) |

NB The Quality of Written Communication marks are not dependant upon the AO3 mark. Scripts must provide sufficient evidence for the assessment of AO2.

A02: 3 Marks
Total Section B 15 marks

Section C -All questions in section C examine AO 3 and AO 2 .
A03 - Students should be able to marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.

AO2 - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

## General Guidance on Marking

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for irrelevant or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing relevant, plausible explanations using evidence and for critical and imaginative thinking. Candidates should also be credited for considering more than one point of view. Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

Marks for Section C questions should be awarded according to AO3 and AO2 level descriptors

The central issue relates to the comparison of works of art, and not simply to judging their individual value. Candidates could make this distinction. This topic is generally unpopular and poorly done. There is an overlap with Section A, but this is deliberate to try and give a clue. Note that candidates are requested to refer to art works they have studied. Failure to do this should restrict answers to top level 3.

The implication of the statement is that the only way to compare works of art is by using objective measures. Many candidates are likely to argue strongly in favour of personal taste rather than objective standards (which they may see as being set by other people). Arguments in opposition to the statement are likely to take the view that any judgement of art is subjective and a matter of personal taste or that there is no such thing as good or bad art, but that all things creative are of equal worth. Arguments for the statement may refer directly to and apply principles of aesthetic evaluation. Some may question why works of art should be compared. Others may recognise that the use of aesthetic criteria in itself is subjective and not objective. They may question the criteria that are used by collectors who pay millions of pounds for individual works. Some may argue that fame of the artist or of the work is the best criteria.

Weaker answers are likely to address only one viewpoint, will be lacking in evidence, and may rely on assertion. They will probably reject the statement and would normally not exceed level 2 or low level 3.
Better answers will try to address different viewpoints, but may have a limited understanding of aesthetic principles and are likely to lack specific evidence. They will normally not exceed low level 4
Stronger answers will be able to support their arguments with specific evidence relating to different works of art and may distinguish between artistic quality and popularity. Some should pick up and deal with the idea of comparing. They are likely to recognise that even aesthetic principles involve a degree of subjectivity. These should reach high level 4

In deciding whether an answer should be placed in Level 1, remember that a summingup conclusion does not have to be at the very end it could be at the start of the essay or in the middle.
Answers without implicit or explicit summing up must be placed in Level 1.
Heavily one sided answers, if developed in a simple way and supported with a little evidence should be placed in Level 3.

Two sided answers with conclusions are always located in Level 4 or Level 5. However, where the arguments are superficial (or barely "connected" to the question) and the evidence supporting them is weak, such answers are unlikely to score more than 14 marks. (Be careful though just because a candidate says "On the other hand ..." it doesn't always mean a counter argument is being offered.)

Candidates who make the kind of points underlined above and introduce good evidence to support their arguments should secure a mark well into Level 5.

## "Moral reasoning is simply a method of justifying what we have already decided to do. <br> To what extent can this view be justified? In your answer you should apply your reasoning to one contemporary issue.

The central issue concerns the nature and purpose of moral reasoning. Candidates who talk in general terms but do not consider a contemporary moral issue should be
restricted to mid level 3. The argument should consider what moral reasoning is and why it is used (if it is used). Most answers are likely to agree with the statement and may be side-tracked into discussing personal moral values. Ideally candidates should be able to apply the principles of (for example) Utilitarianism, Social Contract and religious teaching to their chosen dilemma. To answer the question effectively they must show awareness of 'traditional' moral values and moral reasoning. Some candidates may ignore the thrust of the question and simply address, perhaps in descriptive form, their chosen moral dilemma. Such answers which fail to address the question should not exceed level 2.
Do not penalise candidates who deal with more than one issue.
Weaker answers may either discuss a moral issue in broad terms without really addressing the thrust of the question, or may rely on assertion. Evidence will be limited. They may not address any particular contemporary dilemma.
Better answers will try to examine two points of view and apply them to their chosen dilemma. Arguments are likely to be simplistic and evidence limited. Likely to reach high level 3.
Stronger answers will address both sides of the issue recognising both the weaknesses and strengths of both viewpoints in the context of the chosen dilemma. They may consider whether it is necessary to justify a moral decision in the modern world. They are likely to be well informed about their chosen issue and be aware of different types of moral reasoning.

In deciding whether an answer should be placed in Level 1, remember that a summingup conclusion does not have to be at the very end it could be at the start of the essay or in the middle.
Answers without implicit or explicit summing up must be placed in Level 1.
Heavily one sided answers, if developed in a simple way and supported with a little evidence should be placed in Level 3.

Two sided answers with conclusions are always located in Level 4 or Level 5. However, where the arguments are superficial (or barely "connected" to the question) and the evidence supporting them is weak, such answers are unlikely to score more than 14 marks. (Be careful though just because a candidate says "On the other hand ..." it doesn't always mean a counter argument is being offered.)

Candidates who make the kind of points underlined above and introduce good evidence to support their arguments should secure a mark well into Level 5.

# "The world would be a better place if all government decisions were based on religious teaching.". <br> Critically evaluate this opinion 

Candidates have a number of issues to focus on. The first is whether the world needs to be a better place. Secondly they could consider whether it is the responsibility of individuals rather than government. Thirdly they may consider the possible role of religious beliefs and practices. Some will note that in certain parts of the world religion is still a powerful (and not always helpful) influence. They may recognise that in a world with many religions there can never be consensus and so conflict will increase rather than decrease. Others may argue that the decline of religion in the west has been accompanied by 'improved' social conditions and attitudes. Many will see religion as intolerant and a cause of conflict whereas the key to modern western society is tolerance and a liberal attitude. Some will recognise that the basis of many legal systems is still religious teaching.
Weaker candidates may ignore the question and simply argue that 'the world' is either a good or a bad place. They may take a narrow view and ignore the issue altogether. Some may use the opportunity to defend/ attack the role of religion. Answers are likely to lack evidence and be mainly assertion. Likely to be high level 2 or low level 3.
Better candidates will accept the clues and focus on the possible role of religion. Answers are likely to be one sided and contain assertion rather than evidence. Some may argue that religion is the main cause of problems. Likely to reach high level 3 or low level 4.
Stronger answers will consider each of the issues to argue that at any time there is both good and bad and that religious beliefs still have a major influence. There will be a balanced evaluation of the role of religion in creating society. Some may identify areas where governments are controlled by religious belief. They may question the precise meaning of 'decisions based on'. Such answers are likely to have a sound evidence base to support their response and should reach level 4/ low level 5.

Note the question is about government decisions. Do not reward candidates who simply use their own religious views to argue for the establishment of a new world order (Max level 2 ) unless it is so clearly related to the terms of the question.

In deciding whether an answer should be placed in Level 1, remember that a summingup conclusion does not have to be at the very end it could be at the start of the essay or in the middle.
Answers without implicit or explicit summing up must be placed in Level 1.
Heavily one sided answers, if developed in a simple way and supported with a little evidence should be placed in Level 3.

Two sided answers with conclusions are always located in Level 4 or Level 5. However, where the arguments are superficial (or barely "connected" to the question) and the evidence supporting them is weak, such answers are unlikely to score more than 14 marks. (Be careful though just because a candidate says "On the other hand ..." it doesn't always mean a counter argument is being offered.)

Candidates who make the kind of points underlined above and introduce good evidence to support their arguments should secure a mark well into Level 5.

The central issue relates to who controls the media. Better informed candidates may discuss different models of media control and influence but these should be clearly related to the question to score high marks. Candidates should be aware of different forms of the media and of the way different audiences are catered for. Candidates are likely to refer to Murdoch's political influence through his media control. Ideally they should note that not all media is owned e.g. BBC is public broadcasting. Some may focus on the idea of only whilst others may consider benefit. Some may consider the role of the audience in influencing and directing the media.

Answers that only consider one form of media should not exceed top level 3 (max) even if otherwise there are two viewpoints.
Note that radio and television, newspapers and magazines can count as different forms of media for the purpose of this essay.

Weaker answers will adopt a single viewpoint. Most such answers are likely to argue that the media give the public what it wants, or sales will fall. Examples will be limited. Likely to reach high level 2.
Better answers are likely to be mainly one sided but will be able to support assertions with limited range of evidence. Evidence is likely to be based on a single media form. N.B. no penalty if candidates only deal with single media form. Likely to reach mid to high level 3/ low level 4.
The strongest answers will recognise that there is serious debate as to who controls the content of the media. Some may recognise that different groups may benefit equally. They may question whether benefit refers to profit, power, being well informed or simply pleasure. They are likely to recognise that the media is largely profit making and therefore dependent on sales and audience demand. They are also likely to discuss the power of monopolistic owners like Murdoch who can cater through different organs to different audiences and still serve his own interests. Such answers are likely to reach high level 4/ low level 5

In deciding whether an answer should be placed in Level 1, remember that a summingup conclusion does not have to be at the very end it could be at the start of the essay or in the middle.
Answers without implicit or explicit summing up must be placed in Level 1.
Heavily one sided answers, if developed in a simple way and supported with a little evidence should be placed in Level 3.

Two sided answers with conclusions are always located in Level 4 or Level 5. However, where the arguments are superficial (or barely "connected" to the question) and the evidence supporting them is weak, such answers are unlikely to score more than 14 marks. (Be careful though just because a candidate says "On the other hand ..." it doesn't always mean a counter argument is being offered.)

Candidates who make the kind of points underlined above and introduce good evidence to support their arguments should secure a mark well into Level 5.

No marks are to be awarded for answers that are completely irrelevant or frivolous.

| Level 1 | Partial and inconclusive answers <br> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the <br> question, but with no conclusion either implied or explicit. | $\mathbf{1 - 3}$ marks |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Level 2 | One-sided answer with a simple conclusion <br> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a <br> simple conclusion, which may or may not be appropriate. There <br> may be little explanatory comment. | $\mathbf{4 - 8}$ marks |
| Level 3 | A developed answer which examines one viewpoint <br> Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified <br> conclusion(s). Explanatory comment is simple and restricted. | $\mathbf{9 - 1 3}$ marks |
| Level 4 | A developed answer which looks at two sides of the <br> argument. <br> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show <br> awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a <br> justified conclusion(s). <br> At the lower end different viewpoints are addressed in a <br> superficial way with few specifics and little development. <br> At the top end there is development of one of the viewpoints. | $\mathbf{1 4 - 1 7 \text { marks }}$ |
| Level 5 | A balanced answer evaluating a range of evidence which <br> examines contrasting viewpoints. <br> Selects, interprets and evaluates a range of information, <br> concepts and opinions relevant to the question. Marshals and <br> evaluates the evidence to draw a justified, substantiated <br> conclusion(s). <br> At the lower end the range of information is limited. <br> At the top end the range of evidence is wider. | $\mathbf{1 8 - \mathbf { 2 0 } \text { marks }}$ |

Total A03: $\mathbf{2 0}$ Marks

A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these level guidelines:

| The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter <br> of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few <br> grammatical or spelling errors. | $\mathbf{3}$ marks |
| :--- | :--- |
| (above average) |  |
| The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, <br> arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not <br> inhibit communication. | $\mathbf{2}$ marks |
| (average) |  |
| The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an <br> inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places <br> grammar and spelling inhibit communication. | I mark <br> (below average) |
| The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there <br> may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling OR there is too little of the <br> candidate's own writing to assess reliably. | 0 marks <br> (exceptionally <br> poor) |

NB The Quality of Communication marks are not dependant upon the AO3 mark
A02: 3 Marks
Total Section C 23 marks

